DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 346 HE 000 029

Extension and Public Service in the University of Illinois. Phase I Report.
Illinois Univ., Urbana.
Pub Date Nov 67
Note - 43p.
EDRS Price MF - $0.25 HC - $2.25
Descriptors - Community Involvement, *Community Service Programs, *Extension Education, Higher Education, *Program Planning, Responsibility, *University Extension
Identifiers - *University of Illinois, Urbana

Societal needs and demands, together with the increasing interdependence between the university and its environment have forced the university to reassess its relationship to the wider community and reexamine its service responsibilities. The service function has become an integral and essential part of the academic scene, inseparable from research and instruction functions. The university, therefore, for both external and internal reasons, must decide what its service role should be. To examine the way the University of Illinois is meeting these responsibilities, a study was made of the structural approach to extension and public service, the personnel and finances involved, the clientele served, the methods and techniques employed, and the specific programs undertaken. The results indicated that the university was heavily but haphazardly involved, that the character of the clientele varied greatly, and that so many different techniques were used that no conclusion could be drawn as to which were most effective. An examination was also made of the specific external problems needing attention and the institutional adjustments, in terms of organization, personnel and finance, that would have to be faced in order to meet society's demands and needs. Recommendations for changes are presented in Phase II of the Study. (AM)

EXTENSION AND PUBLIC SERVICE

in the

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED023346

HE 000 029

PHASE I REPORT

November 1967

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

CHICAGO CIRCLE CAMPUS MEDICAL CENTER CAMPUS, CHICAGO URBANA • CHAMPAIGN CAMPUS

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT • URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801

November 20, 1967

President David D. Henry
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Dear President Henry:

This report is the first of two. The interviews and analyses for the second are in progress now, with the special assistance of Professor David Lazarus, on part-time loan from the Department of Physics, Urbana-Champaign campus.

While this report no doubt raises more questions than can be answered in the next year, it is intended as an appropriate context for the questions chosen and for the recommendations later to be made.

The impetus for the study comes from three sources: the internal questions raised by the reorganization of the University as a system of separate campuses; the external expectations generated by dramatic social changes; and the special interest of the recently organized coordinating body, the University Council on Extension and Public Service.

It is appropriate, as the University of Illinois enters its second century in the land-grant university tradition, that we take renewed interest in how best to discharge our public service responsibilities.

Sincerely yours,

Eldon L. Johnson

Eldon L. Johnson
Vice President

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS CENTENNIAL YEAR 1967-68

EXTENSION AND PUBLIC SERVICE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Introduction

This is Phase I of a two-phase report. It states the problem. Phase II will provide analysis and recommendations to be presented to the President of the University of Illinois.

Soon after appointed in 1966, the University Council on Extension and Public Service proposed an examination of its special area of concern in the hope of improving effectiveness. The President and the Executive Vice President and Provost endorsed the proposal.

Later the Council set as terms of reference for the project: "to study the entire extension and public service function and organization of the University, giving priority to areas other than agricultural extension but eventually encompassing all public service functions as thought relevant, and to recommend to the University Council on Extension and Public Service such changes as appear desirable for the improvement of continuing education and public service."

This report, as here presented, is the revision of a preliminary draft presented to and discussed with the University Council on Extension and Public Service and several top administrative officials of the University of Illinois. A special Council sub-committee, headed by Professor John D. Haltiwanger, contributed to the identification of the main problems.

The Setting

Academic personnel come to extension education and public service responsibilities with misgivings and some reluctance. That is the most pervasive and intractable problem of all.

Yet the attitude and approach outside the university are exactly the opposite. Service is regarded as the essence of the university. Teaching is preparation for service. Knowledge ought to be put to use. Application is the most valid test. Taxpayers are entitled to tap the reservoir of talent the state has endowed. And on and on, the voice of the consuming public is heard.

As a result, the university is caught between its external demands and its internal values.

Some internal-external tension is inevitable, even desirable. But the emerging nature of the outside world is tightening the screws on the university quite perceptibly. What is brittle and what is resilient will be sorted out, not by calculated design but by the shape of events.

There have been historic times when the intellectual centers of gravity were outside the universities. This is unfamiliar to us. Our times have seen intellectuals heavily concentrated within the universities. There are powerful forces at large, however, which challenge this continued state of affairs. The triumph of saturation education, the rise of the so-called knowledge industry, the emergence of private entrepreneurship in organized talent, and the possibility of great computer-based public information centers may well force a redistribution of intellectual effort. In any case, the university has its challenge. What does it want to preserve for itself?

What is it willing to slough off, what to share? What are the optimum terms? The potential beneficiaries of university service are beginning to want answers; and the old answers may be neither heard nor heeded in the new society.

There is abroad in the academic land an impression that service as an area of university endeavor has gone the way of horse-age farming and the "cow college" -- on the way out, yielding to more sophisticated, purely intellectual relevance. But there is something about this impression -- or perhaps it is a hope -- which fails to measure up when put to the test. Every speech on the university's role belies it. Every university catalog professes otherwise. Every university statement at legislative hearings denies it. Quite the contrary, those who keep struggling to state and restate the goals of higher education also keep struggling to reassert and revitalize and extend the service role. Far from going the way of the how-to-farm college, the service role is finding vigorous new declarations of purpose and faith even from spokesmen for the private colleges and universities. If cynicism says this is an acquisitive response to potential federal support, the point is only reaffirmed -- the public will be heard and its demands for service will be heeded, if not by one intellectual source, then by another.

President James A. Perkins of Cornell University has given extended attention to a restatement of the public service rationale. In his book, The University in Transition, he writes: "I have dwelt on the close connections of acquisition, transmission, and application of knowledge at some length because we cannot understand the modern university unless we understand these three aspects of knowledge." The "three missions are subtly and intricately meshed" in a coherence necessary for university integrity.

"Institutional policies and arrangements that grossly neglect one function in favor of the others build a low ceiling indeed on the institution's future growth and vitality."

In a similar vein, Clark Kerr, then President of the University of California, classified "involvement in the life of society" as one of the three new faces of change in American universities. "The university as producer, wholesaler, and retailer of knowledge cannot escape service."

Having raised educational levels, lifted expectations, and amassed more knowledge to use, the university cannot deny the burgeoning claims for its talents and services. It can only say, if it chooses, that society should knock on someone else's door, in full knowledge that if the door does not open into the competence sought, society will build new doors for worship in new temples.

There is a problem of definition. Neither "extension" nor "public service" is precise or well-defined. The former historically connotes agriculture, or if we get beyond that, it simply connotes "the same old classes, just taught elsewhere (outside)." Neither is adequate in the modern world. "Public service" can mean the private college's contribution to society by educating young men for life and careers, or it can mean a public university's technical aid to a small industry, or its policy studies for a state government, or its work with a sister institution abroad, or its construction of a component to land on the moon. But, beyond these definitions, much more is still unencompassed.

It is this outgrowing of old conceptions that has created the illusion of a waning service role. Whatever has happened to change that role, the change is for broader, rather than narrower, definition and more numerous areas of application.

What has produced this change? Three factors may be cited.

First, the changing society, having both social interdependence and technological dependence, flows from, feeds back into, and will be sustained by the kind of competence for which the universities are the special trustees, custodians, and transmitters.

Second, higher education is becoming increasingly socialized, public-oriented, publicly aided, and public-policy conscious. It is increasingly the subject and object of public policy. It is "vested with a public interest" as never before, not merely as a source of enrollment for eager students but also as a source of relevant knowledge and useful service for persons of all ages, and for groups with all purposes.

Third, the service component has come to have organic connections with teaching and research which make excision a threat to the health of the whole university body. The university cannot be integrated without it because the three are phases of a replenishing cycle -- (1) discovery or creation, (2) transmittal of the resulting corpus of knowledge, and (3) application to the world's needs, where feedback in turn redirects future research and future teaching, like the target adjustments of a modern artillery piece in action. Each component has its own justification and its undeniable capacity for independent contribution; but such isolation means impoverishment. And just as research enriches teaching, so service adds its dimension to both -- the test of relevance, the capacity to see specialties in terms of total problems, and the freshness of immediacy.

So, if the old conceptions of service do not apply, there will be plenty of replacements. For example, the humanities, heretofore largely uninvolved, may be "put to work." They will have a new public, with new

expectations. With increased leisure, society's capacity for absorption of humanistic talent will present a whole new range of opportunities for the creative and performing arts. Thus a whole segment of the university heretofore largely untouched by the service relationship will become intimately involved, not merely to "entertain" but to know the arts better, to transmit such knowledge better, to prepare producers and users better, and to improve the environment in which all may flourish better.

Likewise, if the original service relationship to "dirt" farming is outmoded, plenty awaits to take its place in those other segments of the nation's economy which are generated by research and serviced by knowledge. The role of education as a vital component in economic growth is a new perception, with far-reaching university implications, not merely in the old-fashioned task of training manpower, but also in attracting industry, in supplying expertise, in shaping economic policy, and in supplying new grist for the technological mill. Furthermore, the challenge is not merely technical: it extends to interdisciplinary planning, to economics as a policy science, and to the environmental studies. Finally, what is lost at home in the by-passed and outgrown economic sectors has insatiable needs and outlets abroad in the developing countries, where universities find an exciting new frontier, different enough to challenge old knowledge and to demand application of new.

Another new field demanding university service is what has been called the "policy sciences" or the "policy studies." These are the bridges between research and action. They are of special relevance in the social sciences and in governmental relations, but by no means confined there. In summarizing its first five years of experience, the Urban Studies Center at

Rutgers University reports that, "Except as an abstraction, it is not always easy to talk about 'research' in urban studies as distinct from 'extension.' To a staff member working in the Newark ghetto, the two are part of the same process." Here again universities are bound to be drawn into new relations with society in the solution of its urgent problems, with beneficial results for all parties. Here will be the great social observatories and field stations in which research-service will take place, and who can say that the master of this art is less at the heart of the university than the man who works under the architectural inscription, "Laboratory"?

These changes, therefore, produce new and greater interdependence between society and university. Each is locked more tightly onto the other in relationships which are mediately healthful and ultimately vital. Likewise, within the university itself, the educational triad of research-instruction-service is being pressed into spherical form. Or to change the figure of speech, each component is tied into the other so that the discrete pieces in theory are becoming a continuum in practice. The changes, in other words, are not all outside the campus. *They penetrate* to the heart of the university itself, to its faculty, to its organization, to its policies. The time is past, if it ever existed, when universities had only duty-bound, self-less reasons for responding to outside importunings for service. They now have adequate internal, indeed self-serving, reasons for affirmative response, to round out their otherwise misshappen forms of attempted congruence with the social order.

So, with this vastly enlarged interface with society, the university needs to reexamine the adequacy of its response to the external challenge.

Debate over priorities among the historic university functions has become obsolete. It is like debating the priority between the functions of the heart and the lungs. Vital processes do not have priorities. But the university is confronted with a dilemma: regarding the service role, its staff may have too little interest and the public too much. Anybody, and any group, may make university demands, and probably will, if special competence is thought to reside in the university. But the university, with limitations in both personnel and finance, cannot be all things to all people. It has to decide, therefore, on what things it wants to be to what people. It cannot escape making a selective response. The difficult task is to make such a response so as to be publicly understood and publicly defensible, while faithful to (indeed while seeking multipliers within) the university's total responsibilities, both internally and externally.

As Sir Eric Ashby, Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University, recently said, there should be ivory towers in a university, but the university itself cannot be an ivory tower. Society won't let it. Neither will its own self-interest, even in the fullest attainment of its own internal goals.

Where We Are

How does the University of Illinois presently attempt to meet these important responsibilities?

The response can fittingly be divided into consideration of:

a. structure

b. personnel and finance

c. clientele

d. methods or techniques

e. programs

Structure

Structurally, the approach to extension and public service, at first glance, seems simple and unmistakably clear: the agricultural and home economics, or rural-life-oriented, type is assigned to the Cooperative Extension Service in the College of Agriculture; and the remainder, the general or the non-agricultural, is assigned to the Division of University Extension. Both are state-wide in their coverage, but the first is organized entirely through the Urbana-Champaign campus, whereas the second is a part of the University-wide, three-campus system. This distinction in location, which has been hardly discernible in the past, will become more noticeable and meaningful as the Chicago Circle campus launches more service programs both in the City of Chicago and elsewhere in the state.

In actual practice, this model is too simple, too pat, too capable of neat distinctions. The public service function does not get done quite that way -- mostly, it does; but by no means all of it.

First, the University Statutes refer to special kinds of extension responsibilities to be exercised in other organizational units. "The

Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations is responsible for fostering and coordinating educational, extension, and research activities in labor and industrial relations, including advisory and information services." Likewise, the Institute of Government and Public Affairs "is responsible for developing campus and in-service programs in public service training; research programs in the field of government and public affairs, advisory services for public officials and agencies; and citizen conferences and courses of current interest in government." In the former case, a qualifying statement is added: "Extension activities are administered by the Division of University Extension." No such statement is added for the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, although both units are obligated to make use of other "University departments and divisions."

Second, beyond these University statutory bodies, there are state and federal statutory bodies for which the University is agent. Of course, the Cooperative Extension Service is the oldest example of the agency relationship, with a federal-state-county base. By state statutory authorization, the Division of Services for Crippled Children, serving 15,000 children annually, is administered through the University of Illinois, Medical Center Campus. Several other state-government operations housed on one of the campuses, or adjecent to the campus, have varying degrees of cooperative linkage with the University. The University Library (Urbana) offers state-wide services as one of four Research and Reference Centers in Illinois, with a state subvention of $125,000 annually. At the federal level, through contracts with the U. S. Agency for International Development, the University of Illinois in 1965-66 spent more than a million dollars in technical assistance to new universities in Asia and Africa.

Third, apart from statutory authorization, there are several major institutes and centers, imbedded in the Colleges, which have quite explicit public service responsibilities. The major ones are:

Bureau of Business Management (College of Commerce and Business Administration, Urbana)

Executive Development Center (same College)

Bureau of Community Planning (College of Fine and Applied Arts, Urbana)

Small Homes Council-Building Research Council (same College)

Highway Traffic Safety Center (College of Engineering, Urbana)

There are important public-service clinics and hospitals, with clients and patients by the tens of thousands annually:

Veterinary Medical Clinics (Urbana)

Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory (Urbana, operated with State of Illinois)

Psychological Clinic (Urbana)

Speech and Hearing Clinic (Urbana)

Research and Educational Hospitals (Chicago)

Division of Services for Crippled Children (Chicago - mentioned above)

Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary (Chicago, operated with State of Illinois)

There are several major research organizations which are so applied in character and so directly related to a non-student clientele that they must also be included:

Research and Educational Hospitals (also listed above)

Agricultural Experiment Station (College of Agriculture, Urbana, although it retains its separation from direct extension functions by working through the Cooperative Extension Service for the transmission of research results)

Engineering Experiment Station (College of Engineering, Urbana)

Center for Zoonoses Research (College of Veterinary Medicine, Urbana)

Bureau of Economic and Business Research (College of Commerce and Business Administration, Urbana)

Center for Urban Studies (Chicago Circle)

Children's Research Center (Graduate College, Urbana)

Illinois Maize Genetics Laboratory (College of Agriculture, Urbana)

Bureau of Educational Research (College of Education, Urbana)

Institution for Tuberculosis Research (College of Medicine)

Institute for Research on Exceptional Children (College of Education, Urbana)

Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (College of Education, Urbana)

University Committee on School Mathematics (College of Education, Urbana)

Institute of Communications Research (College of Journalism and Communications, Urbana)

There are many services for the public as spectators and as "consumers" of the performing arts:

Performing music organizations (traveling groups, like the Walden String Quartet; the University Bands; the University Symphony Orchestra; the choral groups; chamber music groups; the University Opera Group; and the Chicago Circle Band, Concert Choir, Chamber Choir, and Madrigal groups)

Krannert Art Museum (Urbana)

Krannert Center for the Performing Arts (Urbana)

WILL Broadcasting (television and AM and FM radio)

Classical and European Culture Museum (Urbana)

Natural History Museum (Urbana)

Hull House (Chicago Circle)

There are special public-service facilities and conference centers:

Allerton House and Park

Hott Memorial Center

Assembly Hall (Urbana)

Three student unions: Illini Union (Urbana);
Chicago Illini Union (Chicago Medical Center);
Chicago Circle Center (Chicago Circle)

Finally, there are important extension and public service functions built into many of the teaching and research departments, ranging from the major, explicit, and identifiable to the minor, implicit, and disguised. Illustrative of the former category are:

Medical and Dental Illustration Studios (College of Medicine)

Division of Rehabilitation-Education Services (College of Physical Education, Urbana)

Department of Recreation and Municipal Park Administration (College of Physical Education, Urbana)

Still other programs of major importance in reaching the public both near and far, but harder to classify, are:

Libraries on three campuses

University of Illinois Press

Office of International Programs, including Agency for International Development projects (Urbana)

Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc.

Institute of Aviation

Intercollegiate Athletics

Of all this impressive organizational array, only the first two (the Division of University Extension and the Cooperative Extension Service) plus the Division of Services for Crippled Children, could be said to be "strictly extension" agencies. The others have various mixes, ranging from a preponderant extension component to a fraction overshadowed by, but tied into, research or teaching. However, anyway it is looked at, the University's organization for public service is impressive in size, scope, variety, and clientele. One does not get the impression that it is either a minor or a waning function. Deep commitments have already been made to it. It stands on its own recognized base; but it is also "built in" at scores of places where it is a full-fledged partner, even if not the first-named in the partnership.

Personnel and Finance

People and money are good indicators of the importance of a function in an organization.

Almost 1,000 persons are employed by the three large extension units: Cooperative Extension, the Division of University Extension, and the Division of Services for Crippled Children. (See the table on page 15.) In addition to these individuals, however, there are hundreds of regular faculty members in other academic units who teach extension classes, do consulting, care for patients, lead conferences, and work overseas but who are either not attached to extension units or are so attached only for a specific assignment incidental to their main careers. This greatly enlarged figure cannot be calculated accurately. However, the Division of University Extension reports that 900 faculty members participated part-time last year. So it is clear that the number of co-opted or volunteer faculty members participating in merely the more formalized public services will equal or exceed the total number of regular extension employees.

EXTENSION PERSONNEL
(1967-68)

The first figures represent FTE (full-time equivalents); the second figures represent individuals.

	Division of Univ. Extension	Cooperative Extension	Division of Services for Crippled Children	Combined
Academic	49.18 (56)	480.00 (516)	14.21 (21)	543.39 (593)
Nonacademic	90.60 (98)	231.00 (248)	121.96 (127)	443.56 (473)
Total	139.78 (154)	711.00 (764)	136.17 (148)	986.95 (1,066)

EXTENSION BUDGET

Division of University Extension	*Cooperative Extension	Division of Services for Crippled Children	Combined
$3,224,563.00	$6,620,446.00	$4,302,819.00	$14,147,828.00

EXTENSION EXPENDITURES
(From Comptroller's Report, 1965-66)

Urbana-Champaign Campus	$11,507,126.32
Chicago Circle Campus (none so reported)	
Medical Center Campus (mostly services for crippled children)	3,802,225.88
Total	$15,309,352.20

This figure represented more than 10% of the total University expenditure (excluding auxiliary enterprises and student aid).

* This figure is for 1966-67.

Not many would disagree that attention should be given a function with expenditures which approximate or exceed 10 percent of the University total, or the combined expenditures of eight colleges on the Urbana campus. Extension and public service expenditures present that picture. They exceed $15,000,000, according to the latest Comptroller's Report, 1965-66. This is also approximately the figure budgeted for the three large extension agencies alone for the current fiscal year: more than $7,000,000 for Cooperative Extension, $3,225,000 for the Division of University Extension, and $4,300,000 for the Division of Services for Crippled Children. Total expenditures, which will include other smaller units and sums, will substantially exceed this total for 1967-68 -- perhaps rising above $18,000,000 on the basis of proportions applicable heretofore.

But everyone also knows that much more public service takes place under still other University budgets, in some measure of unintended disguise, particularly that type of service which is informal, unstructured, consultative, and inseparably linked with that great body of scientific research which comes to some applied end, or of social science research which merges imperceptibly into program and action. In fact, what could be legitimately classified as public service expenditures would undoubtedly yield a startling escalation if there were some attractive incentive, such as matching federal aid or offsetting institutional grants of unrestricted nature. The point is that determination of the total expenditure in this category is peculiarly imprecise. The attribution of expenditures to public service is generally on the minimal and literal side.

Clientele

A special word is required about the extension and public service clientele, although it is so inclusive as to preclude much meaningful description. What it does not reach directly, it may still reach indirectly. Standards intended to be delimiting may exclude clients on one count but appropriately admit them on another. About the only sure exclusion is the one imbedded in the definition -- regular students already served on-campus.

Clients must fit the University's educational level and come from its appropriate constituency. But infants fit the University's educational level when they contribute to the education of young doctors; and farmers in India, as well as in Illinois, fit the appropriate constituency when they are the subjects of faculty research and graduate theses. Similarly, the mentally ill and the senile fit the educational level when they are clinical material, and students in Asia and Africa fit the proper constituency when they are in universities which the University of Illinois has contracted to help through U.S. technical aid overseas.

The University obtains its public service clients from two sources: (1) what it is obligated to serve by its own charter, statutes, division of labor with other higher educational institutions, or other essentially external authority or decision; and (2) what it chooses to serve as a means of maximizing its service role or furthering its other purposes. Except for farmers, homemakers, and crippled children, few clients are imposed by statute or other outside authority, although the University's discretion is not as free as this implies. Limits on choice are implicit in the University's special role. For example, if extension and public service are to be provided

<u>at all</u> in all those areas and levels effectively monopolized by the University (e.g., areas of medicine, law, pharmacy, and upper division and graduate levels in scores of subjects), the University will have to do it. An implied obligation exists, recognized by the public and hardly to be avoided by the University.

In any case, whatever the source of all the clients and beneficiaries, the University has an extension and public service "public" which at any time is extremely comprehensive -- a veritable cross-section of society -- and over the years encompasses beneficiaries too inclusive for one to imagine any leftovers. This means individuals of all kinds, groups of all kinds, institutions of all kinds.

Some confirmation of this is shown by an examination of the latest extension report from the Medical Center Campus in Chicago. It covers the 1965-66 year. Quick perusal of the specific references in the report (obviously not exhaustive but, in fact, often merely illustrative) identifies these recipients of service:

physicians
surgeons
pharmacists
nurses
dentists
social workers
occupational therapists
chemists
medical record personnel
architects
foreign biologists
safety personnel
dental examiners
psychiatrists
spectroscopists
medical-surgical nursing instructors
graduate students in clinical psychology
school nurses
general public
premature infants
crippled children
epileptics

student residents (from outside)
school children
unmarried mothers
orphans and orphanages
health societies
other hospitals
other universities
public schools
parochial schools
nursing schools
nursing service agencies
private mental health agencies
pharmacies (hospital and private)
pharmaceutical houses
non-profit health organizations
planned parenthood groups
fraternal orders
courts
governments (all levels, country-wide and international)

The sobering thought which lingers after consideration of the variety and scope of clients is the gargantuan task the University has in choosing among the innumerable demands (or "opportunities," if that terminology is preferred), some for acceptance and some for rejection. The University will have immense choices, but it will also have constraints. The question is whether it will have the requisite criteria for making such choices.

Methods or Techniques

The University uses virtually all media and techniques known to education, as it attempts to reach the many beneficiaries named above. The media range from correspondence to computer, courses to consultation, tours to television. The commonest, perhaps because it is familiar and manageable, is the conventional classroom course moved to an off-campus location, or an unconventional content clothed in the familiar formal-course package for a particular audience. This puts minimum strain on the University's conception of its role; hence this kind of "extramural" work, which simply takes the

courses outside, is also embraced in English and other foreign universities which otherwise have little in common with the American conception of "extension," agricultural or general.

This technique is especially attractive for the Division of University Extension, and particularly in programs leading to degrees or certificates. The objective is simply to "extend" appropriate parts of the University curricula to an off-campus clientele. This also simplifies recruitment of faculty for the extension tasks.

In understandable contrast, the Cooperative Extension Service does little of this kind of work, directly out of the campus curriculum. It is also engaged in instruction, although more largely of an informal or unstructured type. Nevertheless, it still reaches its agricultural and home economics audience by courses, lectures, seminars, or other formal, structured means whenever these techniques seem relevant and effective.

So one would have to conclude that the two great University extension arms, agricultural and general, both encompass the spectrum of techniques employable. They differ primarily in their centers of gravity, the agricultural heavy on informal, unstructured relationships, and the general heavy on the formal and structured. The reasons for this are numerous, but chief among them is the complete integration of agricultural extension into the "system approach" (tied in with instruction and research) which has always characterized land-grant Colleges of Agriculture. General extension has never enjoyed this status. As a result, it has often developed insularity and assumed the limited role of the formal transmission of knowledge off-campus.

Methods have to be devised for all kinds of people, with all types of purposes, in all states of readiness, in all degrees of organization,

and in all manner of locations. It is not surprising that every known technique of human communication is used at some time or other.

Again, to cite a concrete illustration, the Medical Center's last extension and public service report refers to courses at all levels, as well as conferences, lectures, seminars, workshops, symposia, and clinics; press, radio, movies, and television; exhibits, tours, and visits; correspondence, demonstrations, and consultation; research and patient care; administration of examinations, both professional and patient; review and evaluation of records; a technical information service; and an infection surveillance program.

Programs

To the preceding generalizations should be added information on specific programs. An inventory would help to show where we are, and might suggest trend lines for the future. However, other sources are already available, with data much too voluminous to be repeated, or even summarized, here.

In addition to the customary annual reports from deans and directors, two special documents provide ample on-target information:

Extension and Public Service
For the Academic Year 1964-65 (62 pages)

Extension and Public Service
For the Academic Year 1965-66 (87 pages)

These were prepared under the direction of Associate Provost Louis Volpp, who was also then secretary of the University Council on Extension and Public Service. The college reports used as a basis for the compilation are also available for background study if still more detail is desired.

So to summarize, any inventory of "where we are" in extension and public service at the University of Illinois leads one to these conclusions:

1. The University's present commitment to this third of the familiar triad, measured by sheer activity rather than conscious priority, probably outstrips all other periods in its history. Whether it does in proportion to activity in teaching and research is impossible to measure. Certainly in absolute figures more is being spent on these extension activities than ever before -- more than $15,000,000 annually.

2. While the internal organization for public service appears logical, orderly, and sufficient, there are significant leakages, circumventions, and extra-organizational activities. (These will be covered in later sub-studies, with the results reported in the Phase II report.)

3. The cross-sectional character of extension clientele reflects the almost unlimited program possibilities facing the University -- the variety and breadth now and the pressure for more and more in the future -- and emphasizes the necessity of adequate criteria for launching some programs and not others, and for setting priorities among those judged worthy of undertaking.

4. The methods employed are as varied as the technology of communication, leaving largely unanswered what specific technology will yield optimum results for what purpose, and particularly what role electronic aids, separately and in "packages," can play in moderating the demands on faculty in terms of numbers, time, travel, and preferred priorities.

What the Problems Are

Several aspects of the public service role of the University call for particular attention if a critical appraisal is desired. Some can readily be identified by outsiders and some by insiders. Some are external and some internal.

External Problems

The great problems of society become the extension and public service problems of the university. The university must respond. These problems, however, are so general that they confront all universities very much alike, in contrast to the internal problems. Also, they are so numerous that particular universities must choose particular aspects for concern and involvement. It is largely futile, therefore, to attempt to identify these external problems with great specificity. What is important, instead, is the establishment of organization, policy, and procedure by which a university may discern, assess, and decide as it systematically surveys the outside world and its needs. In this sense, the external problems are converted into internal problems -- internal problems of creating and maintaining machinery, process, and personnel for programming the University's public service response to new challenges and unmet social demands.

This assigning of external problems to internal machinery should not be misconstrued. The great external problems still have to be faced. In fact, the burden on the internal machinery is made all the heavier; hence special thought should be given the adequacy of such machinery for the larger task. It does not follow that the existing machinery designed to meet current commitments, or the internal machinery which must necessarily exist to carry out merely administrative functions, is what is required.

The question ought to be asked: Is it? And if not, what in addition is required? Obviously, there must be a planning component, the capacity to match up and assess both outside situations and inside resources. There must be an overview, a fresh look, a periodic evaluation, an innovative force to challenge the old with the competing new, and a striving for congruence between social challenge and University response.

When appropriate organization, personnel, and policy are assured internally, then the time has come and the means are at hand to address the new and urgent needs of society. Almost any list would include:

1. rapid obsolescence of knowledge in the professions
2. persistent disparity of incomes and cultural advantages
3. problems peculiar to, or accentuated by, the urban complexes
4. exploding population, increased leisure and greater longevity
5. modern work as an incentive to learning and the resulting demand for flexible education at whatever lifetime stage desired
6. dependence of industry on the latest technological knowledge
7. internationalization of trade, travel, communications, scientific advance, and governmental institutions
8. threats to man's physical environment
9. rising world food requirements
10. conception of education, health, and welfare as human "rights"
11. revolutions of large-scale organization, systems management, and instantaneous communication
12. conversion of individual risks into shared social risks assumed by government

Many new facets of these persistent issues call for conscious University attention and for some kind of an education-service response. This is the grist for a mill which has been properly constructed and adjusted.

Internal Problems

Such construction and adjustment are among the most important internal problems, which may best be examined in terms of organization, personnel, and finance.

Organizationally, one of the first questions is the degree of extension differentiation. Is there such a discrete function, and how separate and distinct should it become organizationally? How far should it be organized apart from instruction and research? The spectrum of choice runs from the model of private X College, which merely relies on its departments to do whatever extramural service each desires, to public Y University, which has a large, well-differentiated extension unit with its own core staff and organizational status co-equal with the combined residential academic units. Where on this spectrum can the University of Illinois best work out the most relevant pattern?

Closely akin is the question of functional inclusiveness. If extension is recognized as a function worthy of special attention and an organization is set up to nurture it, should literally all of the University's outreach functions be channeled through this organization, or some; or should an intermediate mix of direct management and indirect coordination be devised? Running literally all outreach functions through the extension organization is virtually impossible, but it is not easy to identify the exceptions which can be permitted without jeopardizing the coordination effort. Following the logic of functional differentiation, unified extension organizations are

springing up throughout the land -- at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Missouri, the University of North Carolina, and West Virginia University. But even these differ in degrees of inclusiveness, autonomy, and rigor of unity. All that can be said with confidence is that the large complex public university has to decide how it is to fit together, organizationally, the extension and public service functions represented by:

1. general extension
2. agricultural and home economics extension
3. educational television and radio
4. special institutes and units with action-oriented programs
5. special government-aided extension projects (e.g., Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the State Technical Services Act of 1965)

A decision must be made on whether there is to be one or several extension units and, then, how inclusive or functionally preemptive the one or several are to be.

A multi-campus university has the added decision on whether there is to be a university-wide extension organization tied to the President's level, separate organizations tied to the separate campus heads, or some permutation. The University of Wisconsin represents the first concept; the University of Missouri is a variation on the second. A price is paid for the adoption of either model. Separate campuses like to have their own outreach mechanisms, both for tidy administration and for service to what they regard as their own constituency (particularly in a large and demanding metropolitan area). Yet the avoidance of duplication, the marshaling of all the university's resources by problem-solving rather than by geography, and the presentation

of a single front to the "consuming" public argue for a consolidated approach under which the separate campus competencies are subsumed. This is a problem the University of Illinois, like the other great university "systems," cannot escape, as it thinks through the ordering of organizational relationships between center and constitutent campuses.

Likewise, a decision will have to be made on how the State of Illinois is to be blanketed with the services of the University of Illinois, when they are most relevant or desired, without duplicating the services of other state-supported colleges and universities. A few decades ago, the University of Illinois was the state university and it had the extension services for the people of the state. There are now five other public universities, two state colleges, and more than twenty public junior colleges. All of these have some competencies and some facilities which the public at large should be able to tap and use. Whatever the state's obligation to serve the public through higher education, or whatever the public's legitimate demands, several channels of potential service exist. The central question is how to make an appropriate division of labor among all the Illinois institutions possessing service capabilities.

Another cluster of internal problems has to do with personnel for performance of the extension and public service functions. The central themes are these: how separate and independent should the extension staff be (e.g., from the academic departments and conventional disciplines)? and what are the most effective rewards and incentives (including whether they should be separate and distinct)?

It can be argued, and is, that service, like research, is a dimension to be expected of every professor whenever appropriate, not a dimension

consigned to special men specially employed for the task. It can also be argued, and is, that with professorial preoccupation with instruction and research under difficult time strictures, the regular departmental staffs must be supplemented by personnel who make public service a full-time or first-priority concern -- either a separate extension staff or a core of such personnel strong enough to keep the balance within the extension sector. Mixtures, joint appointments, and improvisations are possible, and resorted to quite commonly. Yet the central question remains: where should the center of gravity be in the allegiance, commitment, and concern of extension personnel, and how can it be kept there? This is one of the most difficult of all the internal questions to be resolved.

The question of incentives and rewards is another pervasive and seemingly intractable issue. It stems from the relationships just discussed. If one were to ask the administrative staff of the Division of University Extension of the University of Illinois, or its counterpart elsewhere, several sub-questions would emerge. Among them would be, with obvious duplications, alleged perception of:

1. insufficient faculty commitment to and support of extension
2. administrative indifference and inadequate encouragement
3. instructional shortages where (and perhaps because) reliance has to be made on the regular faculty personnel
4. diminution of the service component in the total "mix" of teaching-research-service which is thought required for optimal professional advancement
5. inequities produced by failure to appreciate the public service role and to apply appropriate standards in evaluating extension personnel.

These sub-questions call for reexamination of the compensation patterns (some already quite unorthodox) used for extension work, the suitability of the promotion techniques and criteria used, and, again, the whole relationship between extension personnel and their departmental counterparts in the same disciplines. Obviously, separate personnel policies are likely to be resorted to only as an accompaniment of an extension organization given great independence in its staffing and career development. This option is now under consideration elsewhere, but there are intermediate arrangements, too. The test is what it takes to get the extension job done, and that means through the most competent personnel who can be attracted or persuaded to meet the challenge. Therefore, incentives and rewards are worth careful scrutiny.

Finally, the internal problems extend, as usual, to <u>finance</u>. Methods of extension support have long been debated. Even in agricultural extension, with its broad federal undergirding, the question is not resolved as to what service should be free and what reimbursed in some way. In general extension, some institutions are adopting a fully self-supporting philosophy. Others adhere to "subsidies" from the regular budget in various fractions -- 50 percent, two-thirds, etc. -- with fees and other charges completing the total. The issue may be resolved on philosophy, expediency, or necessity -- or perhaps even lethargy. But it should be examined; and whatever policy survives or is adopted ought to be made explicit in provisions, assumptions, and expectations.

Another aspect of finance is the role of the federal government, particularly the new role in non-agricultural extension. Some optimists think this aid will greatly expand, and a few think it may eventually eclipse research support because of the "action programs" in which the universities will be asked to enlist. In any case, the federal government already has

modest programs for extension in community services and for technical services to industry. These funds, in Illinois, come to the University through state channels of clearance and coordination (the Board of Higher Education and the Department of Business and Economic Development). Therefore, the University has a minor new problem: how to get maximum mileage out of the new financial support, how to raise the matching portions required, and how to fit the new relationships into the existing (or planned) organization of extension functions.

More Specific University of Illinois Problems

Sharper point should perhaps now be given some of these general problems, with appropriate supplementation, to focus on illustrative applications to the University of Illinois.

1. Service to Chicago.

Whether the University of Illinois has one or several extension units (Cooperative Extension, General Extension, Division of Services for Crippled Children, etc.) and whether each campus (the present three or some future five or eight) has its independent extension organization or is part of a system-wide organization, all parts and pieces will be interested in the Chicago metropolitan area. Chicago, in turn, will be interested in access to all the competencies, wherever they happen to be. The University, therefore, will not have met its responsibilities unless and until it has a pattern of organization and management which will put the total University at the service of the nation's second largest urban complex. This is not to deny that some parts, obviously the closest parts, can be of special and particular service. However, no part can absolve the remainder of their service responsibilities wherever they are best fitted or have a monopoly of special competence. How to fit all

together, how to assign parts, how to focus rather than scatter, and how to give Chicago appropriate open access -- these are the specific problems.

2. Evening Classes at Chicago Circle

This is a companionpiece to the previous question. After the day-time program at Chicago Circle, both undergraduate and graduate, has become established and stabilized, public demand will reopen the question of evening classes for Chicagoans employed in the day-time. It is an inescapable question; timing is the issue. But when the time comes, a question the University should itself help answer, a host of subsidiary questions will arise. To what extent does the existence of evening classes, many in private institutions, diminish the need and limit the field? What is a sensible division of labor with other institutions, and how is it to be achieved? Shall the regular Chicago Circle faculty be used? Indeed is this "extension" at all, or merely night-time offering of day-time degree programs, appropriate for normal administration through an "Evening Division"?

3. Sharing with Other Universities

How to blanket the state with the service competence of thousands of publicly employed professors in eight institutions (and soon more), without duplication, unnecessary expense, and confusion, is an important question of public policy, as stated before. The current and past voluntary cooperation, through the interinstitutional University Extension Committee, appears to suffice now; but what will happen if and when new institutions and new campuses of old institutions are thrown into the balance? How can a dovetailed, state-wide pattern of coordinated service be devised? The Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois raises the same questions.

The problem is graphically presented in the health field. Five medical schools exist in Illinois, but all are in the Chicago area. Only one is publicly supported, that in the University of Illinois. Now, whose obligation is it, for example, to give continuing education to the physicians throughout Illinois? Unlike Kansas, which clearly points the finger at its one medical school, Illinois calls for a conscious decision. The alternative is continued ambiguity and unmet needs.

The crux is this, for all service possibilities: how does it look and how does it work for the Illinois citizen (community, school, or other service recipient)? He wants to tap the reservoir of educational talent assembled by Illinois tax money. He has only incidental interest in the institutional source of his service and certainly no interest in inter-institutional jurisdictional squabbles. However, he is not entitled to indiscriminate and unending demands on the tax-supported "talent tank" (which has teaching and research duties, too). Neither can a state agency dictate the pattern of dispensing "public service" without deep intrusion into the internal affairs of the universities. Therefore, the University of Illinois is obligated both by mission and self-interest to consider carefully its own responses, taking into account the combined demands of other University functions, coexistence with other Illinois universities, "customers" who want service, and scrutinizing public agents whose task is to try to make public policy fit public desire.

4. Off-Campus Graduate Education

Employees of industry and of government seek increased proficiency and higher career levels through further education. Their employers share and encourage these aspirations, preferably on terms which will not interrupt

employment. Therefore, employers and employees combine to urge that educational opportunity be extended to readily accessible sites. This demand can extend to all levels of education, but for the University of Illinois, it has grown more acute at the top levels, both because such jobs demand higher skill and because the University of Illinois has concentrated competence there. Need for formal graduate study, with advanced degrees "in the field," is often expressed. In fact, an interstate manifestation of this is now being considered by the higher education boards of Iowa and Illinois.

It is understandable, therefore, that government departments and public employees want graduate work in public administration offered in Springfield; that industry wants graduate work in business management in Peoria; and that other industry wants graduate work in engineering in the Quad-Cities. But, here again, internal and external interests clash: University personnel are <u>least</u> enthusiastic about exporting graduate education, or about off-campus extension in areas calling for high specialization, close professor-student relations (e.g., joint research and thesis supervision), and peculiar dependence on libraries and laboratories.

So this is another area posing troublesome questions: Are new physical centers, with requisite libraries and other facilities, needed at strategic locations? Are full degree programs needed, or merely courses later to be rounded out for degrees by on-campus residence? To what extent can the center of activity be kept on campus with enough innovation, and permutation of patterns, to get the educational job done under the most favorable circumstances, yet without disrupting employment?

5. Continuing Education for the Professions

Another type of need is tied more closely to a particular set of highly specialized tasks, or to a profession, with little interest in degrees because it is post-graduate. This is a field of such obvious need and merit that many professional schools are already exerting themselves in response. The rapid obsolescence of knowledge mastered for the professional degree is the driving force. Medicine and engineering feel the need most keenly now. Law, business, education, management, agriculture, and the other health professions are not far behind. It is already clear that some of these professional areas require a special continuing education officer who will make it his particular business to devise, in collaboration with colleagues, effective ways of giving alumni, and others, the updating knowledge they need and want.

For example, the University of Wisconsin is pioneering through its services to physicians scattered over the whole state. By a combination of on-campus and off-campus courses, workshops, conferences, and seminars, and with an ingenious use of technological aids, a physician-director in Madison, employed by the University Extension Service, joins with scores of colleagues to cover the state with continuing education. Telephone conferences reach distant clinic and hospital rooms, where a local physician-coordinator and his colleagues have assembled for weekly listening-and-response on a series of announced topics, sometimes reexploring occupied territory but usually viewing the new frontiers.

How much of this can be done long-distance, by proper technology? Where face-to-face relations are required, what shall the facilities be and where? Regional centers throughout the state? How shall the professional

schools organize for the task and how join with extension personnel (or should they?) to meet the challenge? These are questions the University of Illinois must also answer. The Colleges of Law and Medicine already have special officers charged with such responsibilities.

6. Economic Growth of Illinois

Whether one takes the pessimistic view that Illinois is a part of the government-neglected Midwest and an exporter of growth-producing talent, or the optimistic view that the state and region will be the center of the American heartland, soon eclipsing the Eastern Seaboard megalopolis, the University of Illinois has a contributory role to play. What shall it be, discipline by discipline (engineering, environmental sciences, urban planning, agriculture, business, economics, computer science, chemistry, education, recreation, and more)? What shall it be institutionally, overall? And how brought to bear on development and actual problem-solving? How much shall be conscious, planned, and aggressive; and how much can be left to happenstance and mere facilitative response when asked?

An illustrative sub-problem is supplied by the construction of the 200 BEV atomic accelerator at Weston, Illinois. The University is potentially involved on at least three scores: because of the interlacing scientific interests, the new community's design and planning challenge, and the potential opportunity for a special kind of adjacent educational institution. How can the resources and interests of the University find expression which will aid the Weston laboratory, the surrounding community, and indeed the state and nation?

7. Uncovered Areas of Formal Extension Instruction

The Division of University Extension can supply a long list of areas in need of off-campus instruction, the uncovered areas of public demand. What criteria bring a topic or course within the fold and keep others out? What balance should be struck between degree-oriented courses and non-credit courses? Finally, how can the Division of University Extension also strike a balance between promoting public service in the broadest sense and merely offering extension of familiar campus courses to off-campus locations?

8. Campus Public Service Facilities

A partial answer to the above question is the establishment of campus facilities which reverse the flow and bring the recipients of service to the University--to the professors, to the libraries, to the research results, to the "learning places." For many purposes, the adult clients are so scattered that off-campus extension could not possibly reach them. The logical congregating place is the University. Many state universities have special adult education centers, with the classrooms, auditoriums, dormitories, dining halls, and teaching technology needed for such purposes. What is more surprising and significant, some private universities have also built similar facilities, including the University of Notre Dame and the University of Chicago. Thousands of users are served every year.

The University of Illinois has no special center of this kind on any of its campuses. Each student union serves in part. So do the Allerton and Hott facilities, but they are removed from all campuses, with recognized merit for certain purposes. However, a new center specially designed for continuing education is planned for construction on the Urbana campus at some future date, provided substantial outside funding can be found.

Priority for such a center and planning for its integration with all the other aspects of a multi-faceted public service program are also among the tasks immediately ahead. So are the special needs of the Chicago campuses.

9. Faculty Participation.

As stated at the outset, academic personnel come to these extramural responsibilities with misgivings and some reluctance. This then becomes a limiting factor in off-campus instruction, continuing education for the professions, overseas service in technical assistance programs, response to the manpower needs of industry and government, and many other relations with the off-campus world. It is true, however, that whatever the faculty reluctance, the cumulative total of extension and public service is still impressive. In other words, actual faculty participation is far greater than faculty articulation of priorities would indicate, which would seem to indicate that much is done reluctantly, incidentally, or for reasons perhaps not greatly prized by the faculty.

Herein lies a problem requiring analysis and such remedy as is possible. What are the reasons for the faculty reservations? Do they reflect on extension organization, basic University priorities, or personnel or financial policies applicable to public service? What changes would elicit improved faculty response?

One hypothesis is that the faculty member responds in terms of the relevance of the public service to his scholarly interests and professional career, both immediate and long-term. This is plausible and understandable. Otherwise, he is being asked, as he sees it, to divert his attention and take "time out" from what he judges central to his life. Therefore, so goes the hypothesis, the model for establishing relevance is analogous to that found in medical education, where practice and service are an inseparable part of both

instruction and research. To teach is to practice; to practice is to teach. And the two together preclude the magnification of research into a pre-emptive, rather than balanced, status.

If this is a sensible model, how does one get the same balance, the same cohesion, the same service relevance in other academic fields? What are the non-medical equivalents? Assuming that faculty members should not be asked to perform public service which they perceive as professionally irrelevant, what determines such perception? And how can the answer be taken into more intelligent account in planning and administering extension and public service programs? Any light which can be thrown on these questions will illuminate many other interlocking issues.

In summary, these nine problems or problem-complexes illustrate that the University of Illinois has its own specific problems, all of which demand continuing attention or new scrutiny, or both.

What to Do about It?

This is the question on which this report, Phase I, ends. The second and final part, Phase II, will address itself to that query.

In seeking light on the answer, many avenues will be explored, including:

I. Further study and analyses by
   a. special sub-studies and reports on segments of the broad problem
   b. self-analysis and recommendations by the Division of University Extension
   c. use of the University Council on Extension and Public Service to review plans, reports, and Phase I and II drafts

II. Discussions
   a. interviews with all deans, with subsequent conferences within colleges as required, on the public service role
   b. Allerton-type conference of relevant groups as later identified
   c. meetings of University Council on Extension and Public Service and other University personnel with invited guests from other universities, representing relevant outside experience on public service
   d. visits by interested university officers to other universities thought to have suggestive operations.

The completion date for Phase II, with final recommendations, is set for not later than autumn, 1968.

Conclusion

The University's perpetual struggle for relevance requires that greater attention be given its public service role. Some neglected facts must be taken into account:

1. The demands for service from the University are becoming so intense from all sectors of society that even private non-educational enterprises are arising to fill the gaps.

2. Government is entering a strong action-oriented phase of its interest in universities generally and in research specifically.

3. By only a moderately liberal interpretation of "extension and public service," more than a tenth of the University's total expenditures goes to this purpose.

4. Total University expenditures on this function approximate the combined totals for eight colleges on the Urbana-Champaign campus, indeed the combined total for all such colleges excluding Liberal Arts and Sciences, Agriculture, and Engineering (1965-66 figures).

5. The Chicago metropolitan area presents special public service problems and opportunities the state university cannot and does not want to escape.

6. There is a correlation between public service and public support which even private universities are increasingly recognizing and which public universities may neglect only at their peril.

Speaking to a University-community audience in Champaign in September, 1967, President Fred Harrington of the University of Wisconsin said the public service or public responsibility role of the land-grant

university is in serious danger of neglect. Ironically, while the most distinguished of this type institution strives to become elitist and purist, the great private models thus emulated are becoming aware that they must emphasize their service responsibilities.

The need, however, is not to return to some halcyon past -- "some academic Walden" -- but, rather, to revalidate a historic mission in terms of the urgent present and the more insistent future. "The university," says President James A. Perkins, "has come too far to retreat before what may be its finest hour."